

Comment on the review paper of Amsler

D.V.Bugg^a and A.V.Sarantsev^b

a) Queen Mary and Westfield College, London E14NS, UK

b) St.Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, 188350 Russia

Abstract

We present a dissenting view of some aspects of the work of the Crystal Barrel collaboration.

We have found through the World Wide Web a review article Claude Amsler has submitted to Reviews of Modern Physics and entitled “ $\bar{p}p$ Annihilation and Meson Spectroscopy with the Crystal Barrel”, hep-ex/9708025. We have major disagreements of both history and scientific fact concerning this review. This page summarises the points on which we disagree.

The article has not been approved by the collaboration. It is the private view of Amsler. In our view, it misrepresents the historical sequence of discoveries. The review presents in detail a point of view developed by Zurich members of the collaboration. They are entitled to express their opinions. However, it seriously misrepresents much other work within the collaboration and fails to reference many papers and experimental facts which conflict with the Zurich line. We appreciate that disagreements can occur, but we believe that there is a responsibility to expose these disagreements in a review article. Otherwise, the reader could be misled into believing the disagreements have been resolved in favour of the view being expressed; that is not the case here.

One of the important results cited by Amsler is the discovery of three 0^+ mesons; (a) $f_0(1500)$, now regarded as the prime candidate for the 0^+ glueball, (b) $f_0(1300 - 1370)$ and (c) $a_0(1450)$. We wish to set straight the actual history of this discovery. There were two crucial steps. The first was

the production during 1990-1992 of data on channels $3\pi^0$, $\eta\pi^0\pi^0$ and $\eta\eta\pi^0$ by Mainz and Karlsruhe groups. The second step was a Coupled Channel analysis by QMWC and St. Petersburg groups, using the N/D method and showing that all these three channels could be fitted consistently with the three 0^+ resonances mentioned above. The latter work was done in August 1992, during a visit to Queen Mary and Westfield College by Anisovich and Sarantsev from St. Petersburg. Their visit was specifically in order to carry out this analysis of the Crystal Barrel data and was cleared in advance with the Steering Committee of the collaboration. For the purposes of this work, they are seen officially as visitors to Queen Mary and Westfield College. The work was reported to the collaboration at its meeting in September 1992, as may be verified from the minutes of the collaboration. After much discussion and checking by both the Mainz group and by Michael Kobel (CERN), it was cleared for publication at the collaboration meeting in July 1993. The analysis was presented at the Marseille conference at the end of that month. It was also presented shortly afterwards at the NAN conference in Moscow. Reference to the first two presentations are not given by Amsler. They are:

- (a) Hadron Spectroscopy, D.V. Bugg, Int. Europhysics Conf. on High Energy Physics, Marseille, France, ed. J. Carr and M. Perrottet, (Editions Frontieres, Gif-sur-Yvette, France, 1994), p717.
- (b) V.V. Anisovich, Proc. Second Biennial Workshop on Nucleon-Antinucleon Physics (NAN93), Phys. of Atomic Nuclei 57 (1994) 1595.

Subsequently, this Coupled-Channel analysis was published in four steps:

- (c) V.V. Anisovich et al., Phys. Lett. B323 (1994) 233,
- (d) C. Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B333 (1994) 277
- (e) V.V. Anisovich et al., Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 1972
- (f) D.V. Bugg et al., Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 4412.

The last of these references is not given by Amsler.

What has happened since 1995 is that two competing analyses have developed and the available statistics have increased roughly tenfold. The Zurich group have developed a Coupled Channel Analysis using the K-matrix approach and based only on Crystal Barrel data. The first Zurich Coupled Channel Analysis was submitted for publication on May 29, 1995 and published roughly 1–1.5 years behind references (a)-(f) above. It appeared as Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B355 (1995) 425.

We do not object to Amlser presenting the Zurich line, but it should be made clear that there is a difference of opinion and there exists an alternative treatment of the Crystal Barrel data from within the collaboration itself. An important paper giving the most recent analysis of the UK side of the collaboration is that of Abele et al., Nucl. Phys. A609 (1996) 562.

Some of our conclusions are significantly different to those of the Zurich group. We include in our analysis Argonne and BNL data on $\pi^-\pi^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 K_S^0$ and GAMS data on $\pi^-\pi^+ \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$. For the $\pi\pi$ S-wave we have refitted the actual published moments of the CERN-Munich experiment. These additional data are all fitted by the Abele et al. paper, where they are shown to be entirely consistent with Crystal Barrel data, but better in certain points of detail. The Abele et al. paper finds a very different mass, 1300 ± 15 MeV for what Amsler calls $f_0(1370)$. It also comes out with a much narrower width. The same result was obtained in the framework of the K-matrix approach (see refs. (h),(i) below). Branching ratios are evaluated in the Abele et al paper in a different way to Zurich work and this leads to substantially different results, which have a strong bearing on the physics interpretation placed on the resonances by theorists.

Subsequent papers by Anisovich et al., listed below, bear strongly upon the interpretation of Crystal Barrel data, The analysis has been extended using the T-matrix approach, then the K-matrix. This work adds a considerable volume of data from other experiments, namely CERN-Munich, GAMS, VES and data on $\pi^-\pi^+ \rightarrow K\bar{K}$ from Brookhaven and the Argonne. An important feature of this work is that it has removed the inconsistency between Crystal Barrel and GAMS by demonstrating that the GAMS $f_0(1590)$ is explained by interference between a broad background amplitude and $f_0(1500)$. References are as follows:

- (g) V.V. Anisovich, A.A. Kondashov, Yu.D. Prokoshkin, S.A. Sadovsky and A.V. Sarantsev, Phys.Lett., B355 (1995) 363.
- (h) V.V. Anisovich and A.V. Sarantsev, hep-ph/9603276; Phys.Lett., B382 (1996) 429.
- (i) V.V. Anisovich, Yu.D. Prokoshkin and A.V. Sarantsev, hep-ph/9610414, Phys.Lett. 389 (1996) 388.

Apart from the 0^+ mesons, other resonances discovered by the collaboration have been $a_2(1650)$, $\eta_2(1645)$ and $\eta_2(1875)$, (though there was some

earlier evidence for the latter from CELLO and Crystal Ball). New resonances seem to us to be one of the “achievements of the Crystal Barrel collaboration” and should appear in a balanced review of the experiment. This work is not presented in the review, but is listed without comment in the references. These resonances have both been confirmed in a recent preprint by the Omega group at CERN, hep-ex/9707021, to be published shortly in Physics Letters.